

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Allan (EP 1 017 206). Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections based on Allan because Allan does not disclose all limitations of the claims, as explained below.

Claim 1 calls for the retrieval of "data representing content information about the context of usage of the apparatus." The content information is retrieved using a predetermined URL or identifier for the content information. While, the Examiner considers Allan to disclose "data representing content information about the context of usage of the apparatus," the Examiner has not disclosed where any such teaching is specifically found in Allan. Thus, the Office Action fails to meet the requirements of MPEP § 707.07(d): "Where a claim is refused the ground of rejection [should be] fully and clearly stated." Applicant is therefore unable to respond to the rejection because no reference has been made to anything in Allan that specifically corresponds to the recited limitations.

In fact, Applicant has carefully reviewed Allan and submits there is no teaching for using a predetermined URL to retrieve content information on the context of usage of an apparatus. This is not surprising: Allan provides network infrastructure, while the present invention is directed to a system for assisting users in finding context related information for an apparatus. Various examples are given on pages 3-4 of the specification as to what is meant by context-related usage and nothing along the lines of the examples given is seen in Allan. The

Page 5 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 29, 2003  
Serial No. 09/635,549

association of a URL with an apparatus enables a user to immediately receive context information, about, for example, how to use a consumer appliance, warranty programs, etc. In contrast, while Allan may discuss data flow between the devices and the Internet, it does not disclose that any device has an associated, specific URL for content information is contextually relevant.

Content information is widely considered information that is presented to a user through an interface so that it may be perceived and used by a user. No discussion of data in Allan speaks of content for users, let alone content that is contextually relevant to an apparatus associated with a URL or identifier for the data. Allan's focus on network infrastructure simply does not entail consideration of the specific nature of data pushed through the network. In view of the foregoing distinctions, claim 1 and directly and indirectly dependent claims 2-4 are patentably distinct over Allan, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-16 directly or indirectly recite the same distinguishing limitations as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as given above. Further, the Examiner has not identified other features recited in the claims.

Regarding claim 4, there is no disclosure in Allan at Col. 1, lines 14-15, 20, or elsewhere, of a dedicated button for retrieving content information related to the context of usage of an appliance, as claimed. The cited passage merely states that the home network has access to the "outside world". This clearly is not anticipatory of the recited limitations. Claim 4 is therefore allowable for at least this reason alone.

Regarding claims 11-12 the Examiner has not identified in Allan any "key dedicated to initiating, via the apparatus, retrieval of data...." As discussed in connection with claim 4, there is no such key or button. The rejection of these claims is therefore traversed for at least this reason alone.

Page 6.- RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 29, 2003  
Serial No. 09/635,549

Applicant notes that claim 5 has been cancelled and claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form using the limitations of claim 5. This amendment raises no new issue and should be entered.


(In view of the foregoing reasons for distinguishing over the cited references, Applicant has not raised other possible grounds for traversing the rejections, and therefore nothing herein should be deemed as acquiescence in any rejection or waiver of arguments not expressed herein.)

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits that in view of the foregoing arguments and/or amendments, the application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including extension fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 5, 2003

  
Bradley M. Ganz  
Registration No. 34,170  
P. O. Box 10105  
Portland, Oregon 97296  
Telephone: (503) 224-2713  
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172  
email: [brad@ganzlaw.com](mailto:brad@ganzlaw.com)

**Correspondence to:**

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131 USA  
Telephone: (408) 617-7700  
Facsimile: (408) 617-4856  
USPTO Customer Number: 24738

Page 7 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 29, 2003  
Serial No. 09/635,549